



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,734	10/16/2003	Enrique David Sancho	2062.001US3	1773
21186 7590 12/30/2008 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
WINTER, JOHN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3685				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,734

Applicant(s)

SANCHO, ENRIQUE DAVID

Examiner

JOHN M. WINTER

Art Unit

3685

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-36 and 40-43 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 34-36 and 40-43 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/15/2008
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

The Applicants amendment filed on September 15, 2008 is hereby acknowledged, 34-36, 40 and 43-44 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

1. The Applicants arguments filed on September 15, 2008 have been fully considered.

The Examiner states that Pare Jr. discloses “ Once a BPID processor receives a bid biometric sample and PIN for identification, the processor searches through its database, retrieving all registered biometric samples that match or correspond to that particular bid PIN. Once all corresponding registered biometric samples are retrieved, the processor compares the bid biometric from the message to all retrieved registered biometric samples. If a match is found, the processor transmits the identity of the party back to TP 26. If no match is found, the processor transmits a "party not identified" message back to TP 26.” (Column 11, lines 39-49).

The Examiner submits that the method disclosed by Pare fully meets the limitations of the amended feature "the at least one second mini-server message including a first identification for the user, generated using the first computer fingerprint file." The message sent by the Pare Jr. method is based upon the result of matching a biometric sample (i.e fingerprint file), therefore the Examiner concludes that it is obvious that the generation of the message is based upon analysis of the fingerprint file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 34-36, 40 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 34 recites "generated using the first computer fingerprint file;" however there is no corresponding process that implements any generation; therefore the claim is indefinite.

Claim 40 recites "message containing information indicating that a user was verified" however there is no corresponding structure in either the first or second input unit that implements any verification process, and is therefore indefinite.

Claim 40 is indefinite because it is a hybrid claim. In particular, the claim appears to be directed to neither a "process" nor a "machine," but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention. Evidence to support an

interpretation that claim 17 is a *product* is (1) the preamble which states "a vendor computer " and (2) the body of the claim which recites "a first input unit"

Alternatively, evidence that indicates the claim is directed to a *process* or method is the body of the claim which recites "to communicate with a second server to receive a second server message containing information indicating that a user was verified,the verification being based on a first identification for the user, generated using the first computer fingerprint file. . . ." Because of this conflicting evidence, it is unclear if claim

17 is a product or process claim. See the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection above. See MPEP §2173.05(p) II or Ex Parte Lyell, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (B.P.A.I. 1990). For prior art purposes, the Examiner interprets the claim as being drawn to a product claim.

Claims 35-36 and 43-44 are dependant upon the above rejected claims and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 34-36, 40 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pare Jr. et al. (US Patent 6,269,348) in view of Joshi (US Patent 4,688,169) and further in view of *St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

2. As per claim 34,

Pare Jr. et al ('348) discloses a method for verifying a user and a user computer comprising:

receiving at a first mini-server at least one first mini-server message from the user computer, the at least one first mini-server message including a first fingerprint file;
(Column 11, lines 39-42)

comparing the first fingerprint file against a second fingerprint file to verify the user computer, the second fingerprint file accessible by the first mini-server;(Column 11, lines 39-45)

receiving at a second mini-server at least one second mini-server message from the user computer, the at least one second mini-server message including a first identification for the user; (Column 16, lines 4-28) generated using the first computer fingerprint file
(Column 11, lines 39-49) .

comparing the first identification for the user against a second identification for the user to verify the user, the second identification for the user accessible by the second mini-server;
(Column 11, lines 39-48)

Pare Jr. et al ('348)does not specifically disclose a "computer" fingerprint; Joshi ('169)discloses a "computer" fingerprint (Generally disclosed by Abstract, figure 1), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Pare Jr. et al ('348) reference in view of Joshi ('169) in order to restrict prosecution of a transaction to a specific user/machine pair.

Pare Jr. et al ('348)discloses the claimed invention except for " after the comparing of the first identification for the user against the second identification for the user to verify the user, generating a third mini-server message at the second mini-server based upon the results of the comparison ", It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to use a third message, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

3. Claims 32, 33 and 40-43 are in parallel with claim 34 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

4. As per claim 35,

Pare Jr. et al ('348) discloses a method for verifying a user and a user computer comprising:

- (a) sending the first mini-server message to a vendor computer; and sending the second mini-server message to the vendor computer.(Column 11, lines 45-48)

5. As per claim 36,

Pare Jr. et al ('348) discloses a method according to claim 35 further comprising:

authorizing an action by the vendor computer only if both the first mini-server message contains information indicating the user computer was verified and the second mini-server message contains information indicating the user was verified.(Column 11, lines 39-42; Figure 6)

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN M. WINTER whose telephone number is (571)272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.
- If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt can be reached on (571) 272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMW

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685